

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

Claims 1–41 were previously and are currently pending and under consideration.

Claims 1–41 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 16, 27, and 35 are amended herein.

No new matter has been added.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the in-person Interview of 5/9/2008. During the Interview Applicant explained aspects of the invention. Applicant noted that the invention involves pre-processing features' steps performed before a query is actually executed. Applicant also explained, and Examiner tentatively agreed, that the only query pre-processing in Bailey involves spelling correction, after which Bailey performs a query. In sum, the parts of Bailey compared to the steps of the present claims occur *after* a query is executed.

Applicant has amended the claims in several ways requested by the Examiner. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the system is a computing system and the elements thereof are embodied in a processor and/or storage media of which the computing system is comprised. The claims are also amended to clarify that the query being prepared for execution is a new query for which a user is seeking results (Bailey's historic queries have already been executed). The claims have been amended to clarify that execution of the new query involves searching for data of the data source that matches the query. The claims have also been amended to emphasize query *pre-processing* to prepare to execute a query.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §§ 102 AND 103

Claims 16–26 and 35–41 stand rejected anticipated by US Patent Publication 2005/0004889 (Bailey). Claims 1–15 and 27–34 stand rejected as obvious over Bailey in view of US Patent 6,460,0209 to Fries.

Amended claims 1, 16, 27, and 35 recite performing various steps before a query is executed. As discussed during the above-mentioned Interview, Bailey is concerned with formatting results of a query after the query is performed. Furthermore, Bailey selects which data sources (141–146) to query based on explicit user selection (selection box 220 in Figure 2; last half of paragraph 0043).

Applicant also respectfully notes that the user's query is modified (e.g., per the determined query type, claim 1) before it is executed. The only modification of a user's query in Bailey is spelling correction.

With respect to the obviousness rejections, Fries is cited only with respect to grouping of terms.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The dependent claims are allowable based on their dependence from the independent claims. The dependent claims are also allowable based on the features recited therein. For example, claim 6 recites "query terms that identify the query as a local query seeking information related to a specific geographic region from which the query originated". The cited art neither discusses nor suggests this feature. Withdrawal of the rejection of the dependent

PATENT

claims is respectfully requested.

PATENT

CONCLUSION

The present application is in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is requested.

Should any fees be required in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

If the Examiner believes a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: 5/14/2008

By: /James T. Strom/

James T. Strom, Reg. No.: 48,702
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone 425-939-0781